



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,813	10/30/2003	Donald H. Osterberg JR.	ORCL-2002-183-01	2479
45591 7590 02/05/2008 ORACLE C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP TWO NORTH MARKET STREET THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113			EXAMINER WHIPPLE, BRIAN P	
			ART UNIT 2152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/698,813	Applicant(s) OSTERBERG, DONALD H.	
	Examiner Brian P. Whipple	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9 and 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2,4-9,11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/14/08 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, and 11-20 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues the Goldman reference does not teach receiving a request for authorization to forward an electronic mail message. Examiner points out that Goldman is not relied upon for this limitation. Rather Kaminski is used for such. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of

references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

5. Applicant argues the Goldman reference does not teach responding to a request from a sender requesting authorization to forward an electronic mail message. Examiner points out that Goldman is not relied upon for this limitation. Rather Kaminski is used for such. Again in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

6. Applicant argues the Goldman reference does not teach including verifying a source address included in the received electronic message against an address the authorization indicator is sent to. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Goldman discloses sending an authorization request, or indicator, to the purported sender address, and correspondingly the sender responding to said request ([0063]). Goldman also discloses such an authorization check being done by an administrator verifying authorization of a purported sender and therefore indicating a valid address through authorization ([0063]). Furthermore, Kaminski discloses an authorization indicator (Kaminski: [0036], lines 10-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-2, 4-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminski et al. (Kaminski), U.S. Publication No. 2005/0044155 A1, in view of Goldman, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0233418 A1.

9. As to claim 1, Kaminski discloses an unsolicited e-mail internet protocol source address verification method (Abstract, ln. 1-3) comprising:

receiving a request for authorization to forward an electronic mail message ([0032], ln. 1-2; [0034], ln. 1-4 and 9-15);

responding to said request for authorization to forward said electronic mail message ([0035], ln. 1-3 and 8-10), wherein a response to said request for authorization includes an authorization indicator that indicates a source of said request for authorization (Kaminski: [0036], lines 10-12); and

handling receipt of said electronic mail message (Fig. 10, item 450).

Kaminski is silent on verifying the source address included in the received electronic message against the address the authorization indicator is sent to.

However, Goldman discloses verifying the source address included in the received electronic message against the address the authorization indicator is sent to ([0063]; the purported address is verified against itself or the manager's address through the use of an authorization request for indicating authorization).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kaminski by verifying the source address of an electronic message against the given address or a manager's address as taught by Goldman in order to detect spoofed sender addresses, the occurrence of which typically indicates junk e-mail (Goldman, [0063], lines 11-14) and/or allow a manager to control whom is classified as unauthorized in a mail system (Goldman: [0063]).

10. As to claim 2, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said request is initiated by a source of said electronic mail message (Kaminski: Figure 7, item 258 of SENDER'S MAIL CLIENT 14; [0034], lines 9-15) and

said request asks a simple mail transfer protocol agent for authorization to send an electronic mail message to a destination serviced by said simple mail transfer protocol agent (Kaminski: [0036], lines 1-4).

11. As to claim 4, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said authorization indicator is send to a source address identified in said request (Kaminski: Figure 7, item 268; [0036], lines 10-12).

12. As to claim 5, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including performing an indication generator process in which an authorization indicator is generated (Kaminski: Figure 7, item 268; [0036], lines 10-12).

13. As to claim 6, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 5, including said authorization indicator is a unique bit string (Kaminski: [0044], lines 1-3; [0045], lines 8-11).

14. As to claim 7, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including tracking said source address (Kaminski: [0036], lines 4-9).

15. As to claim 8, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including inserting an entry into said electronic mail message indicating said address said authorization indicator is sent to before forwarding said electronic mail message to an end use destination (Kaminski: [0046], lines 13-20).

16. As to claim 9, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including extracting a request source address from said request (Kaminski: [0034], lines 9-15; [0035], lines 1-3); and

utilizing said request source address as a destination address in a header file of a return package including authorization indicator information (Kaminski: [0022], lines 20-23; [0025], lines 3-4; [0035], lines 1-3; [0036], lines 10-12).

17. As to claims 11 and 17, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

18. As to claim 12, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 11, including said instructions direct determination of electronic message authorization (Kaminski: Page 8, left column, line 47; [0032], lines 1-2; [0034], lines 1-4 and 9-15).

19. As to claim 13, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 11, including said instructions include:

formulating a request for permission to forward an electronic message including a permission request source address (Kaminski: Figure 7, item 258; [0034], lines 9-15);

analyzing said request for permission (Kaminski: [0035], lines 1-3; [0036], lines 1-4);

sending a permission reply to said permission request source address (Kaminski: [0036], lines 10-12);

forwarding an electronic message, including said permission indicator in a header (Kaminski: [0044], lines 1-3; [0045], lines 8-11; [0046], lines 13-20); and

tracking said permission request source address and a source address of said electronic message when received (Kaminski: [0036], lines 4-9).

20. As to claim 14, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 13, including a message initiator inserts an indication in a header of a communication packet that said initiator is attempting to establish a communication link for a purpose of forwarding a message to a particular destination (Kaminski: [0038], lines 1-11),

said header also includes an indication of an initiator or source address (Kaminski: [0025], lines 3-5).

21. As to claim 15, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 13, including said permission reply includes a permission indicator (Kaminski: [0036], lines 10-12).

22. As to claim 16, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15, including a time stamp is maintained of when said permission indicator is generated (Kaminski: [0046], lines 5-11).

23. As to claim 18, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 17, including transmitting a request to send said unsolicited electronic message, wherein said request includes a request sender's identification (Kaminski: [0032], lines 1-2; [0034], lines 1-4 and 9-15).

24. As to claim 19, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 18, including said request is transmitted to a simple mail transfer protocol agent and said simple mail transfer protocol agent forwards a verification indicator to a request sender's source address (Kaminski: [0034], lines 9-15; [0035], lines 1-3).

25. As to claim 20, Kaminski and Goldman disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 19, including said verification indicator is a unique bit string (Kaminski: [0044], lines 1-3; [0045], lines 8-11).

Conclusion

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571) 270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/698,813
Art Unit: 2152

Page 11

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BPW

Brian P. Whipple
1/29/08

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152
February 1, 2008